DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 985 CS 207 824

AUTHOR Freeman, James Andrew
TITLE A Study of the Relationship between Personality Factors and Growth in Student Writing Ability.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 95p.; M.A. thesis, Humboldt State University. Pages 73-83 of the document, which contained the Omnibus Personality Inventory, were removed because of copyright restrictions.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS High Schools; Holistic Evaluation; *Personality Assessment; *Personality Traits; Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; Writing (Composition); *Writing Evaluation; *Writing Improvement; Writing Instruction; *Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Omnibus Personality Inventory

ABSTRACT

A study correlated the results of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) and two holistically scored narrative writing samples to determine how high school students' intellectual and emotional characteristics affected their writing improvement. Students in a small West Coast high school completed the OPI and generated a pretest writing sample in September and a posttest sample the following May. Fifty-seven complete sets of data were correlated. Students showed a mean improvement of .52 on the holistic scale. The standard deviation indicated that the 30 students who improved and the 10 who regressed did so substantially. Seventeen students showed no growth. The correlation between writing scores and the OPI indicated that student attitude orientations played a demonstrable role in writing ability, although this assessment was limited by the inconstancy of personality traits. Those whose writing regressed showed a positive relationship with the thinking introversion category on the OPI, a negative interest in complexity, a flexibility toward religious orientation indicating open-mindedness, and a low correlation with social introversion. The improved writers indicated a negative relationship with high impulse expression, and rated low on the anxiety scale. They also indicated high scores on the altruism scale. These results suggest that rethinking of the role of student personality and motivation in learning is necessary if teachers are to help students improve their writing. (Narrative assignments, evaluation criteria, and student writing samples are appended.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED237985

A Study of the Relationship Between Personality Factors and Growth in Student Writing Ability

---

A Thesis Project
Presented to
the Department of English
Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

---

by
James Andrew Freeman
December 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James Andrew Freeman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 207824

This thesis is dedicated to my family, friends, to Kristin Kelly, and to the memory of John Lennon. Special thanks to Professor Tom Gage, Ron Huizing, and Hoopa High School.

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Chapter One: Introduction and Literature Review	1
	A. The Project	1
	B. The Method	7
II.	Chapter Two: Results	19
	A. Writing Diagnostic Results	20
	B. Improvement in Writing and O.P.I. Scale Correlation Results	21
III.	Chapter Three: Conclusion and Implications--Writing Liberates the Mind and Spirit?	36
	A. Conclusion	36
	B. Implications	39
IV.	Appendices	50
	A. Appendix A	50
	1. Directions for Students	50
	2. Directions to Evaluators	51
	3. Student Samples	54
	B. Appendix B	59
	1. Description of the O.P.I. Scales	59
	2. Descriptions Based on Most Frequent Responses	64

Page

C. Appendix C 84

1. Report on Effectiveness of Redwood Writing Project Participants Teaching at Hoopa High School 84

2. Redwood Writing Project Evaluation of Teacher Attitudes Nine Months After Each Summer Institute 89

3. Redwood Writing Project Questionnaire: Averaged Results for the Years '77, '78, and '79 90

4. A Teacher by Teacher Comparison of Percent and Rate of Growth 92

V. Tables 94

A. Table 1: Writing Diagnostic Results 94

B. Table 2: O.P.I. Scale Correlation Results (calculated to hundredths) 95

VI. A Selected Bibliography 96

Chapter One:

Introduction and Literature Review

Because the quasi-science of teaching writing has begun to come of age, it is an exciting time for composition instructors to be alive. New theories and practical techniques are floating down to us like colored ribbons: education theorists such as Moffett, Diederich, Elbow, Kohlberg, Emig and Britton are freeing charged ideas in a bursting bouquet of ticker tape at a parade that shows no signs of being rained out. Happy days are on the way. We're smarter, but the growing pains of our newborn infant, born to the mixed parents of objective science and mystical art, loom ahead. I want to help in some small way. I want to set loose a crepe paper ribbon. I want to demonstrate, perhaps for the first time, that students whose narrative writing improves also have certain attitude orientations.

The Project

I have set out to examine the role of personality traits on student writing. In particular, I am interested in studying how different intellectual and ethical orientations influence and correlate with improvement in writing. My project, consisting of two separate evaluation components, the Omnibus Personality Inventory and a longitudinal wholistic writing sample, is designed to assess aspects of students' intellectual and emotional personalities, to generate two narrative writing samples from each student for use in conjunction with the personality assessment, and to measure growth in writing ability.

The first component of the project is the wholistically evaluated writing sample, designed to give an overall, non error-related assessment of a student's writing ability. Responses in this type of sample are made to a prompt question given to all the students participating. These responses are read by evaluators as "whole" pieces of writing and are not broken down into various "particle" aspects during evaluation. In other words, the student essays are read for an overall impression rather than for a particulate analysis of the component parts contributing to the effectiveness of the paper. Thus, the wholistic method has an initial advantage in evaluating student writing skills because it examines actual student writing instead of particle or fractured responses illicited by multiple choice tests. Further, the wholistic method assumes that all of the component qualities that make up good writing cannot be usefully separated: form merges with content, style with message, etc. Evaluators read the pieces quickly, impressionistically, seldom rereading, ignoring errors in spelling, usage or syntax, unless they begin to detract from the overall effectiveness of the paper: that overall impression is primary. Multiple readings help cancel out differences in a particular evaluator's subjectivity.

The exercise is administered to the students twice. It is intended as a longitudinal study of growth in student writing, subject to developmental changes and the influence of an entire year of English curricula.

Such wholistic evaluation of writing is gaining national popularity as a quick and accurate means of assessing student growth, faculty effectiveness, program design, and school-wide instructional success. The Educational Testing Service's (E.T.S.) "General Impression" procedure, a wholistical technique applied in scoring its English Composition Test, has been used with great success. In a recent issue of College English, Cooper and Odell call the impressionistic procedure "a highly reliable rank ordering of student writing within a reasonably short time... it has high predictive validity...correlates reasonably well with grades students make." (Odell and Cooper; College English, Vol. 42, No. 1, September 1980, pp. 35-43) They go on to state:

> These procedures, and the assumptions underlying them, are widely accepted. They are used in school district evaluation studies, in research studies, and in large-scale assessments such as the California State Writing Assessment. This widespread acceptance must be due in part to the relative speed and reliability which this scoring procedure affords; large amounts of writing can be rank ordered in a relatively short time. More important, these procedures allow E.T.S. to make reliable predictions about how well a student is likely to do in subsequent English courses.

Due to the efforts of such educators as Diederich, Lloyd Jones, and researchers in E.T.S., we may soon see wholistic assessment used in schools at all levels as a valid diagnostic or proficiency measure in subjects beyond writing. Certainly, in the field of writing, the wholistically-evaluated sample has advantages over such innane language skill tests as the short answer S.A.T. and the English proficiency exams given by many schools. Wholistic scoring asks quite simply: "Given the range

of performance in the set of papers from which this paper came, is this paper above average or below average--and how much above or below--in the impression it makes on me after a quick reading, all of its various features considered as a whole?" For my purposes, the wholistic method of evaluation seemed most appropriate. A more specific discussion of the evaluation criteria is to come.

Because I was examining the influence of both the intellectual and emotional dispositions of students on their writing skill, I needed a means of assessing those dispositions. Since one of the most important areas to be considered was the relationship between ethical developments and wholistic improvement in writing, I also needed a psychometric test that measured such developments.

The second experimental component is the Omnibus Personality Inventory, developed by Paul Heist and George Younge working at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at U.C. Berkeley. The O.P.I., composed of three major "categories" and 14 "scales," is an excellent measure of many developmental factors in a student's personality. It has been used nationally at the college level for two decades, often for comparison with other indicators such as S.A.T. scores, career goals, grades, persistence in college, and a host of other concerns. Most notably, the O.P.I. was used as a major component in Trent and Medsker's brilliant longitudinal study of 10,000 high school graduates called Beyond High School. While most

of the statistical information associated with the O.P.I. concerns college-age students and graduates, the inventory and its 14 "scales" can be used with validity at the high school level as well.

It is important to note that the O.P.I. is not an achievement test, nor does it suggest "success" or "failure," but rather measures different proclivities and orientations among people. Professor of Psychology Paul McReynolds says of the O.P.I.: "...(Its) relevant domain is certain attitudes, values, and interests relevant to academic activity and the functioning of late adolescents in an educational context...A particular strong feature of the O.P.I.'s rationale is its focus on intrinsic, as differentiated from extrinsic, factors in learning... The O.P.I. seems to be especially useful with respect to the important intellectual attitudes and values, and probably handles this area better than any other current inventory..." (Paul McReynolds et al., "Personality Tests and Reviews II," in Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook Reviews: Personality-Nonprojective, 7:116, pp. 494-99) There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to the O.P.I.'s 380 plus questions, only answers that demonstrate variation within the individual. I will examine the O.P.I. in more detail soon. First, the importance of student attitudes must be considered.

New research in English has shown student attitude orientations to play a great role in tangible learning. The O.P.I. allowed me to test attitude proclivities that have traditionally

been considered unimportant when compared to actual class curricula. We now know, thanks to a landmark, three year research project at Wisconsin State University, that student attitudes and motivation are "the most significant factors" related to success in composition classes: more important even than teaching grammar or any aspect of the subject matter. (Eulert, "The Relationship of Personality Factors to Learning in College Composition, CCC, May '67, pp. 62-66)

Our newborn science can no longer afford to ignore this vital learning tool whereby "70% of student performance can be predicated by items measuring, for the most part, a student's attitudes and values." The Wisconsin study has shown us that a student's performance in a composition class cannot be accurately predicted by the factors we normally consider significant: the number of papers written, type of grading used, amount of grammar taught, and the student's percentile ranking and "intelligence" are not so important in the end as the student's attitudes and beliefs. (Eulert) For example, it is now a proven fact that students who are concerned with people and issues outside themselves do better in college composition courses. We have seen the tip of the iceberg.

The Method

In order to insure that high school students as young as Freshmen had enough language skill to understand the questions asked on the O.P.I., I arranged a "dummy run" in an Arcata High School English class. Although the results obtained after scoring the inventories fell well below the college-age means, as one would expect, there were no significant problems with their comprehending the questions asked on the Inventory. After this success, the path was cleared for administering the O.P.I. to an entire high school. Humboldt State University's Professor Tom Gage helped choose Hoopa High School, located on the Hoopa Indian reservation and part of the Klamath/Trinity School District.

Hoopa High's small size made it possible to obtain an adequate sample without huge logistic problems and it offered other attractive features as a site for the study. The school is unique in that its students remain with the same instructors from September to May each year: a "pre" and "post" writing test given at Hoopa is a true measure of the learning the occurred in a given English class during the year. Also, approximately half of Hoopa's English instructors had been participants in Humboldt County's Redwood Writing Project summer seminars for teachers, workshops designed to teach new methods in writing instruction. It would be interesting to find out whether the project participants' classes benefited from their teachers' new techniques and teaching methods. Preliminary studies of

two similar teacher education composition programs, the Southern Arizona Writing Project and the University of Oregon Writing Project, showed that the participants noticed great changes in the quality of their students' writing. (Fleming et al., "What We Did Last Summer...," CLAC-7, May '80 and Freeman, "If You Teach Writing Write," Teacher, Oct. '79, pp. 74-77) A three year "post" survey of Redwood Writing Project participants for the years '77, '78, and '79 had indicated that 84% of the teachers felt that their students' writing had improved over the previous year's work: expectations were high. Here in Humboldt County, we had an opportunity to try to verify the Redwood Writing Project's effects by tabulating how many students improved or regressed on the longitudinal writing sample in each class at Hoopa High.

Another reason for choosing Hoopa High was that it was one of the only high schools I knew of that had already begun using a school-wide writing diagnostic essay. I had planned originally to design a multi-mode writing instrument of my own, for use in searching for correlations between the O.P.I. and success in each of the three traditional modes of writing, but since the high school had already administered the "pre" portion of their narrative diagnostic essay, Hoopa seemed ideal as a location. After obtaining permission from the Hoopa Board of Trustees, Principal James Allen and the English Department, two weeks of O.P.I. testing began. Professor Gage had helped to pave the way. Now I familiarized the department with the O.P.I. and

scheduled the actual days of testing in order to standardize the test taking time. Hoopa English instructor Ron Huizing and I began anguishing over what type of "post" writing diagnostic essay to use.

Because the September 1979 "pre" section had been a narrative question about one of several possible machines going berserk, Huizing and I decided that the "post" section too must be narrative, written under similar conditions. My experience while teaching at Humboldt State taught me that it would skew the validity of the sample to give a narrative question at first and then later require a sample in the expository mode.

Once, during a quarter requiring a "pre" and "post" diagnostic essay, we were given a choice between administering two essay questions, one requiring a primarily narrative response and one requiring an expository one. We could choose which question to administer first and which one to give at the end of the quarter. Since I was teaching two sections of composition using an identical curriculum, I decided to administer the "narrative" question first in one class, and the "expository" first in the other. As might be expected, the section given the "easy" question first and the "hard" one second showed little growth. The scores in the other section soared. The department wide sample, an inconsistent mix of two different diagnostics administered randomly, showed only about a 2% growth rate. Either we weren't earning our pay or the diagnostic was faulty.

If our purpose here was to measure growth in a particular mode of writing, Huizing and I had to insure consistency and to avoid specifying that one sample be in first person and another in second or third. Tense was also left unspecified as in the "pre" test. Since the first sample had been a choice of berserk machines, we chose to reuse the identical question nine months later, specifying only that the student could not write about the same machine, and, even if a student could remember which one he had chosen, a fresh response was thus assured. (See Appendix A for a copy of the question and directions to the student).

Since the study was to be performed "blind" to students' names, class, and grade levels, each "pre" test was coded with a random six digit number, also tabulated on a master cross referencing list available only to Huizing and I. The "post" tests were then coded with the same six digit number, moved up one numeral on the first digit to indicate end of the year samples given in May. In this way, the evaluators could have no idea of which writing samples they were reading, nor whose.

After a traumatic but exciting period of testing, a team of nine evaluators, each with teaching experience and a background in wholistic writing assessment, was assembled. Gage, Huizing and I decided that the "pre" and "post" writing samples would be evaluated together in a randomly mixed pile in order to insure validity. We would use the same team of evaluators, working in the same room at the same time on samples which were

coded only by the random number with no indication of grade level, time of testing, class, or student's name. None of the evaluators taught at Hoopa: six were Humboldt State writing instructors, the rest taught at local schools.

Since our team of evaluators had worked together on a similar wholistic assessment at another school only weeks earlier, the task of familiarizing each reader with the evaluation criteria went smoothly. I simply provided each evaluator with a copy of our six sets of evaluation criteria and with some real student samples. These samples were chosen because they ran the gamut of the six point criteria, and, after discussing the range and purpose of each evaluation criteria, our readers began a "dummy run" evaluation of the sample papers in order to "normalize" the scoring. (See Appendix A for a copy of the evaluator's six point criteria, and students' samples). Each student sample was to be read twice, by two different evaluators, and assigned a numerical score from one to six by each of them. These numbers were combined to yield a total score on each sample. Should a point difference of two or more occur between the two mandatory readings, a third reading by a new evaluator was made. This additional score was averaged with the other two. After the wholistic assessment was performed, I could begin the tedious task of recording the combined scores for each student on another master list and determine which samples were taken in September, which in May. In this way each student would have two combined writing scores, one on the "pre" test, one on the

"post" test. Thus growth or regression in narrative writing ability could be determined for each student.

While planning for the post narrative sample was going on, the O.P.I. testing came to an end. We now had a school-wide group of inventories, each composed of some 380 plus true and false questions that needed to be scored and grouped in scales. Professor Gage had suggested using a group of reliable high school students in scoring, and, with the help of Arcata High School German Club Advisor Allan Edwards, I arranged a team of seven bright students for this purpose. We met three times for several hours at a session, until all the inventories were scored. Six evaluators divided the O.P.I.'s 14 scale overlays among them, and we simply ran the answer sheets past each student in a production line. The seventh member of the team and myself were responsible for making random spot checks to insure that each scale overlay was being properly aligned on the answer sheet and that each score was accurate. Scoring was a simple matter of placing the overlay on top of the answer sheet and counting the number of true or false dots marked out of the total possible on that particular scale. (See Appendix B for the complete O.P.I. scale description, copies of its questions, and answer sheets).

I was especially interested in examining the first "Intellectual Disposition Category" for each student. This category, composed of a core of the Thinking Introversion (TI), Theoretical Orientation (TO), Estheticism (ES), and Complexity (CO)

scales, indicates intellectual values and interests as opposed to non-intellectual ones. The scales titled Autonomy (AU) and Religious Orientation (RO) finish this "Intellectual Disposition Category" which examines intrinsic intellectual interests of specific types. The Thinking Introversion scale, made up of questions indicating a high personal interest in a broad range of ideas found in literature, art, and philosophy, and the Theoretical Orientation scale, a more restricted measure of interest in theoretical scientific or logical matters, were of special interest because they might also correlate with improvement in writing. I was also interested in the Complexity scale, composed of questions that indicate an interest in novel and sometimes diametrically opposed ideas, and the Autonomy scale, which measures independent critical thinking not necessarily subject to traditional authorities and social institutions. The Autonomy scale was especially important because I hoped for a significant correlation between high scorers on this scale and those who improved greatly on the wholistic evaluation.

It is important to note here that Heist and Younge had found little significant correlation between extremely high scores in this first category and academic achievement, especially in terms of grades. They felt that many students who scored lower overall in the "Intellectual Disposition Category" were able to succeed in school because they were motivated to pursue learning as a means to an end, an end such as getting a high paying job or meeting their parents' expectations of a

college education, and seldom for the intrinsic satisfactions gained from the acquisition of knowledge through independent inquiry. High scorers, on the other hand, did seek knowledge for its own sake, tended to pursue educational or long range academic careers, often gaining a doctoral degree, and usually showed significant correlations between the verbal component of the S.A.T. and each of the "Intellectual Disposition Category's" six scales. In a sample of 183 college students, there was a .54 correlation (r of .20 to be significant at .01 level) between the S.A.T. verbal score and the Autonomy scale. Oddly, there was no correlation between high autonomy scores and college grades. It may well be that we do not often reward independent thinking, lending credence to the historical fact that many intellectual and creative geniuses did poorly in school.

Another finding of interest here came from a study of 37 graduate students compiled by Heist and Younge. In a faculty rating of assimilation and logic in writing performance, the Thinking Introversion and Theoretical Orientation scales showed a correlation of over .30 (r of .24 required, to be significant at .05 level). Thus, these two scales seemed to have something to do with writing.

The second major category of concern was the "Social-Emotional Category," composed of the following four scales: Social Extroversion (SE), Impulse Expression (IE), Personal Integration (PI), and lastly Anxiety Level (AL). I strongly suspected that high scorers in Social Extroversion, a scale that measures a

preference for relating to people in groups socially, and Impulse Expression, a scale whose questions indicate a preference to express impulses and seek gratification by overt action, would tend to be good narrative writers, especially in the first person where their concern with the self would be best served. Also, I was curious as to what role the Personal Integration scale would play. The Personal Integration scale is a determinant of how few socially alienated and emotionally disturbed attitudes a person holds: high scorers tend to be well adjusted; low scorers often avoid others, experience feelings of hostility and aggression, and feel isolated.

It is interesting to note that Heist and Younge found an inverse correlation between the Social Extroversion scale and both the verbal and math components of the S.A.T., and the grade point average of the 183 college students sampled in the prior study. Likewise, Personal Integration seemed to have an inverse relationship with the S.A.T., and Impulse Expression with grades. This first finding is slightly disturbing: can it be that our extremely outgoing students, and we all know who they are, are less likely to succeed in the academic world? If so, the stereotypical comparison between the very socially active student whose academic performance is merely adequate and the more studious student who excells at the expense of social skills may well be true. Another disturbing finding was the lack of a correlation between persons scoring high in Personal Integration, presumably a highly desireable trait, and success on either of

the two S.A.T. components. Could it be that schools, as often argued, have little to do with human life, that persons who aren't apprehensive are not academically competitive, at least if we take the S.A.T. as an indicator of present school curricula? Perhaps students who are highly grade conscious must by definition be apprehensive and thus show lower Personal Integration. One finding concerning Personal Integration that does make sense emerged from Heist and Younge's factor analysis. Impulsivity or a high Impulse Expression score was shown to come at the expense of Personal Integration; there was a -.33 correlation between Impulse Expression and Personal Integration with approximately 8% of variance. Apparently, wise men do not yell.

The third and last major category of the O.P.I., the "Miscellaneous Category," is made up of the following four scales: Altruism (AM), Practical Outlook (PO), Masculinity-Femininity (MF) and the Response Bias (RB). I was extremely interested in the Altruism scale, composed of questions that determine an individual's concern for the feelings and welfare of others, because I felt that such affiliative, trusting and ethical persons might also be more receptive to growth in their writing abilities. High scores had proven to be involved in community service, concerned with the plight of others, and interested in promoting equality and justice under law. Correlations or none, the Altruism scale would tell us much about the ethical and utilitarian nature of American high school students. Also of

note, the Practical Orientation scale, which consists of questions determining a person's orientation toward applied abilities and those who value material possessions and concrete accomplishments, showed, as one might expect, a negative correlation with the Theoretical Orientation scale on Heist and Younge's factor analysis, and a strong negative correlation with the other "Intellectual Disposition" scales as well. I was not interested in examining the Masculinity-Femininity scale as it was irrelevant to my study and displayed what I thought to be culturally biased thinking. The Response Bias scale, an internal measure of the student's test taking attitude, told me if a student's answers on the O.P.I. were an attempt to "make a good impression," whether they were random, or whether the test taker cared about valid answers at all. Scores too far above or below the mean on the bias were excluded from this study at a specific cut-off point.

After considering exactly what sort of correlations to expect and hope for, and after scoring all of the O.P.I.s, I was ready to prepare a master referencing list including all the significant information for each student. This was to be the last step in the "semantic" preparation of the study: from this point on I would be concerned with the "grammar" of the project; punching computer cards and playing with computer programs. This master list had to contain each student's identification number, his plus, static, or minus score on the wholistic writing assessment, and each of his scores on the fourteen individ-

ual O.P.I. scales. In addition, I thought it might be interesting to keep track of where each student fell within eight subcategories that Heist and Younge had mapped as variations above, at, or below the mean on the "Intellectual Disposition Category." Thus, another several weeks of work began: things were beginning to gell.

Chapter Two:

Results

After transferring all the coded data onto preliminary master data cards, I keypunched a card for each student in the study. An unforeseen change in the correlation program which I had picked necessitated that I redo all of the cards a second time, following another format. A minor error in a control card further delayed running the data. Finally, with the error corrected and all of the student scores and identification numbers correctly punched, the first deck of cards was run. Due to the fact that each student had to attend school on the day of the "pre" sample, on two separate days of O.P.I. testing, and on the day of the "post" sample, there was considerable attrition; only 57 complete sets of data from Hoopa's 150 plus students were available.

Separate from this study, I investigated the data for the Redwood Writing Project, assessing the Project teachers' classes, which amounted to 61 complete "pre" and "post" writing samples. I was not using the results of the O.P.I. in this evaluation. (See Appendix C for R.W.P. evaluation results including an important summary report, and related data).

All the writing samples and O.P.I.s were evaluated and returned to Hoopa whether part of a complete "set" or not. In this way, every writing sample, whether "pre" or "post," was evaluated (a total of approximately 250 papers) and every O.P.I. was scored (a total of approximately 125).

Writing Diagnostic Results

In the sample-wide survey with 57 sets of complete data, Hoopa High students showed a mean improvement of .72 on the wholistic scale. For the sample, the standard deviation was 1.76, indicating that those students who improved and those who regressed did so substantially. In all, 30 students improved over the year, 17 showed no growth, and 10 regressed. Since each paper received 2 combined scores from the 6 point wholistic criteria, a total possible gain from 2 points to 12 was possible for each student. Hence, the .72 improvement figure indicates a 7% growth rate for the sample. This is significant, especially considering the extremely low growth rate in the Humboldt State University study cited earlier (growth of 2%). Parenthetically, a three-year research project at Wisconsin State University indicated that as many students scored lower on an identical "pre" and "post" A.C.T. English Usage Test after taking Freshman composition as scored higher. (Eulert) Clearly, any growth suggests successful instruction in writing: here three times as many students improved as regressed. (See Table 1 for a breakdown of the writing diagnostic results).

Of the 30 students whose scores improved, there was a mean gain of 2.0 on the scale with a standard deviation of 1.21. It seems that those who improved over the year made great strides: these students showed a phenomenal 20% growth in writing ability.

Of the 17 students who showed no growth, there was, of

course, no improvement, though this does not mean that these particular subjects were poor writers. Some of these students scored quite high on the "pre" test but earned the same score on the "post" sample. This statistic means simply what it says: there was no growth in writing ability over a year of instruction.

Of the 10 students whose scores dropped, there was a mean regression of -1.90 on the wholistic scale with a standard deviation of .83. This supports the finding that those who regressed, like those who improved, changed substantially. These students, though few in number, regressed in writing ability at a 19% rate.

Improvement in Writing and O.P.I. Scale Correlation Results

Running the first deck of cards containing the data for the whole sample revealed low correlations among all of the scales on the O.P.I. and improvement in writing.[1] I had planned to run separate decks for each of the three subgroups in the sample: those who improved on the gain score, those who stayed the same, and those who regressed. In this way, I could find differences in the personality orientations of each of three groups and determine how those differences may have effected growth in writing.

[1]Kathy Keech, Director of Writing Assessments for CRDHE at U.C. Berkeley, has determined that correlations from .1-.29 are "low" in education research, while correlations from .3-.59 are "moderately strong," and those above .6 are "high."

This technique did yield stronger correlations, both positive and negative.

The "Intellectual Disposition Category" and its six scales correlated weakly with gain scores on the whole sample. The subgroup of 30 improvers showed weak and even negative correlations with "intellectual disposition." The subgroup of 17 students with no gain scores showed, of course, no correlations. Surprisingly, it was the group of 10 regressors who displayed higher correlations with the scales composing the "Intellectual Disposition Category." (See Table 2 for whole sample and subgroup scale correlation results).

The Thinking Introversion (TI) scale showed a weak .18 correlation with writing gain scores from the whole sample. This is not significant. Likewise, the isolated group of 30 improvers had only a .18 correlation with TI. Contrary to my expectations, the regressors had a .37 correlation with Thinking Introversion! This is contrary to Heist and Younges' finding in their above mentioned study of graduate students where TI correlated at over .30 (r of .24 to be significant at the .05 level) with a faculty rating of written performance. This also seems to conflict with Trent and Medskers' finding that students who persist in college are more receptive to growth in intellectual disposition. (Trent and Medsker, Beyond High School, CRDHE, University of California Berkeley, 1967, p. 151)

Why did the regressors tend to have a higher personal interest in a broad range of ideas? Perhaps the answer to this

question has to do with the type of writing sample used in the study: perhaps students with higher TI scale scores are able to write better in the expository mode than in narrative. Perhaps Thinking Introversion fails to manifest itself in narrative writing in a like manner to Heist and Younges' finding that high intellectual dispositions do not reflect in college grades.

The Theoretical Orientation (TO) scale correlated even less with improvement in writing for all of the study groups. In the whole sample, there was a .08 correlation: in the subgroup of 30 improvers there was a .04 relationship, and among the 10 regressors the correlation was a negative one, -.07. Though this negative correlation reflects my intuition that students with theoretical interests write better, the insignificant positive correlation among the improvers offers no proof of that hunch.

One disturbing finding of the Wisconsin study cited previously was that most of the students scored extremely low on the "aesthetic" scale of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values profile, their instrument used to assess personality. Since Heist and Younge had demonstrated that their Estheticism (ES) scale correlated at .61 or better (r of .20 to be significant at the .01 level) with the "aesthetic" scale on the Study of Values, I wanted to determine whether Hoopa's students would also do poorly on this measure of diverse interests in all artistic matters, including literature and drama. This hypothesis was borne out: the mean score on the ES scale of the O.P.I. was

a mere 8.79 out of 24 items. It seems that many young people are not all that concerned with matters of esthetics. I mention this only because the Wisconsin project found little relation between success in the composition course and importance placed on esthetic values. I have refrained from examining the mean scores for the sample on each of the separate scales, except as they relate to writing ability. However, a very interesting personality profile of the young student would emerge from this sample should someone choose to do so. Perhaps someday...

Corresponding to the Wisconsin findings, my sample showed no relationship between the writing gain score and the O.P.I.'s Estheticism scale. For the whole sample there was a slight negative correlation of -.01: for the writing improvers there was a -.04 relationship, and for the regressors a .15 correlation. Esthetic interests seem to have nothing to do with improvement in narrative writing.

Correlations with the Complexity (CO) scale are again low, although there was a surprise. The whole sample had a .04 relationship with the writing gain score and the subgroup of 30 improvers showed a negative correlation of -.17, neither of which are significant. The writing regressors, however, had a stronger negative correlation of -.28, which suggests that those students who display a weaker interest in novel and sometimes complex ideas also tended to be weak in their ability to write. Strangely, Trent and Medsker found that many college dropouts scored high in the CO scale. They say: "It may be too, that

many of the withdrawals, higher than the persisters to start with in complexity of outlook, intellectual curiosity, and tolerance for ambiguity as measured by the Complexity scale, sought more from their college experience than did many persisters." (Trent and Medsker, p. 151) Is there some fault in college curriculums that keeps these students from persisting? More specifically, is there something in high schools' composition programs that lets students with little interest in complexity become "writing dropouts," less able to write a good narrative piece at the end of the year? The answer is a mystery.

Although I had anticipated a strong relationship between the Autonomy (AU) scale and the writing gain score, the numbers just weren't there. In fact, there was another surprise. The whole sample showed a correlation of .16 and the improvers had a -.10 relationship, but the writing regressors showed a .33 correlation between AU and decline in writing ability! It looks as though those students who display more independent critical thinking, not necessarily subject to traditional norms, are likely to decrease in narrative writing ability. I am genuinely puzzled. I consider a sense of autonomy a highly desireable trait, one that would probably help one's writing ability. Clearly, we need to know more about this.

Religious Orientation (RO), the last scale in the "Intellectual Dispostion Category," showed positive correlations with all of the groups in my study. In the whole sample there was an insignificant .08 relationship, and among the writing improvers

an even smaller .01 one. Among the writing regressors there was a .34 correlation! This again tells us something unusual but definitive. The RO scale measures a tolerance for religious flexibility: high scorers in RO are often skeptical of conventional religious beliefs, especially those that are orthodox or fundamentalistic. Hence, our writing regressors were more tolerant and liberal in their religious thinking than those who improved. The evidence seems to weakly support the hypothesis that students of a more traditional religious orientation improve more readily in narrative writing. Again, we need more research in this area.

So far, considering just the scales in the "Intellectual Disposition Category," my findings read like a "Who's Who in declining writing ability." Several factors seem to be predictive to some degree in accounting for regression in narrative writing ability: none seem to be predictive of improvement. What factors do have to do with successful writing improvement? God knows we all have our intuitions, but our newborn science affords precious little empirical data. The best indications I could find came from the Wisconsin study.

They found five significant factors that are predictive of success in the composition course, and hopefully, by extension, in writing. First, the number of semesters of high school English, more than the particular curricula, had an effect on success in the college composition class. Second, the student's opinion of his high school instruction matters: students who

were poorly prepared and who rated their instructors highly tended to fail; well-prepared students tended to rate their high school teachers more realistically and succeeded more often. Third, the student's score on the "economic" scale of the Study of Values was predictive: the higher the concern for pragmatic matters of money, the lower a student's performance in composition tended to be. (We will soon see a similar pattern with the related O.P.I. scales). Fourth, the student's score on the "social" scale of the Study of Values was predictive. (We could reasonably expect the O.P.I. to verify this). Last, the student's change in attitude toward English from pre-test to post-test was important: a good attitude upon entering college had no relationship to later success; change was the necessary factor. Students with a beginning negative attitude were as likely to do well as those with beginning good attitudes if neither changed, and students with poor attitudes who decided that they liked English more after the course actually improved greatly. (Eulert) These, then, are items of note. We shall soon see if any of the scales in the "Social Emotional Disposition Category" cooberate these findings. Before doing even this, we should verify what items do not seem to effect student learning in the English class.

Eulert's report on the Wisconsin project indicates several factors that do not effect student performance greatly, some of these are confirmed by the correlations we have reviewed. As mentioned, beginning student attitude toward the course makes no

difference and likewise parental attitude toward college success has little effect on actual student success. Neither the student's own rating of his effort to excell, nor his attitude toward college in general matters much. Also, the numbers of papers written and the size of the high school he came from have no import. Significantly, the importance a student placed on esthetic values had little bearing on success in the college composition course. This finding is confirmed by the lack of a significant correlation with student scores at Hoopa High between our writing gain scores and the Estheticism scale of the O.P.I. Likewise, the importance a student places on theoretical values had no relationship to success in the composition course at Wisconsin State University. Again, this fact seems to concur with the lack of a significant correlation between the Theoretical Orientation scale on the O.P.I. and the narrative writing gain scores. Further, the Wisconsin study showed that the students' orientation toward political and religious values had little effect on success. While my study has yet to assess the importance of political values, the above finding confirms the conclusion that religious values do not correlate directly with growth in English as evidenced by the O.P.I. Finally, the student's quartile rating on the A.C.T. Usage Test and the amount of emphasis placed on grammar by the college English instructor have little or no effect on success in the course. Another nail has been driven into the coffin of teaching and assessing grammar by itself.

By examining the four scales that make up the "Social, Emotional Disposition Category" of the O.P.I., a clearer picture of what factors influence growth in writing ability emerges. On its first scale, Social Extroversion (SE), there was a .16 correlation between SE and the writing gain score for the whole sample. The 30 improvers showed a .09 correlation. Contrary to expectations, there was .28 correlation among the writing regressors and Social Extroversion. This relationship suggests that socially vigorous students may be more likely to regress in narrative writing ability during the year. Similarly, Heist and Younge had found an inverse correlation between SE and the S.A.T., but I had expected a different result with writing. I had expected that Social Extroversion would go hand and hand with narrative writing ability although perhaps not with expository; this was not the case. One would think that story telling and greater license to use first person point of view may connect strongly with those students who speak and behave comfortably around others, but this was not so. Just as Heist and Younge found that SE did not correlate positively with the S.A.T. or college grades, so have I found that it does not correlate with growth in writing.

For the whole sample, the Impulse Expression (IE) scale correlated at a negative -.06 with the writing gain scores. The isolated improvers showed an even stronger negative -.29 relationship with Impulse Expression. The regressors showed a similar negative -.26 relationship with IE. Seemingly, high impulse

expression has little to do with self expression in narrative writing, at least as measured by the O.P.I. Perhaps even narrative writing is too deliberate an act to assuage uninhibited spontaneous impulses. Also, there was no relationship between high impulse expression and regression in narrative writing, although Heist and Younge have demonstrated an inverse relationship between IE and college grades.

The Personal Integration (PI) scale correlated negatively at -.10 with writing gain scores for the whole sample and at a positive .18 with the writing improvers. This somewhat insignificant correlation tends to back up an intuitive feeling that students with high personal integration would tend to write better. The evidence is inconclusive, however. The writing regressors also displayed a .09 relationship between Personal Integration and the writing gain score. I might add that there was a large standard deviation of 10 points out of 55 on the PI scale among Hoopa students, which indicates variety in the students' personal integration.

The mean Anxiety Level scale score at Hoopa was fairly high at 11.9 out of a possible 20 items. More specifically, there was a negative -.02 correlation between anxiety level and the writing component for the whole sample. Surprisingly, there was a .23 correlation between the anxiety level scale scores and the writing gain scores of the writing improvers. It is important to note here that the Anxiety Level scale is an inverse one: that is, the more a student admits to feelings of anxiety when

answering the O.P.I.'s questions, the less anxious the student is in actuality. Hence, a high Anxiety Level (AL) score indicates a lack of anxiety in the student. Therefore, our writing improvers tended to be less anxious and exhibit less symptoms of anxiety than those in the rest of the sample. The writing regressors showed a negative -.12 relationship with AL. Can it be that the lack of anxiety is a factor in growth in writing ability? In other words, is anxiety an important factor inhibiting student learning? My findings tenatively indicate that it is. The writing class that reduces anxiety among students appears to be the most successful one. I should note that many comprehensive student surveys, including Daly and Millers' work, have shown composition courses to be the most feared classes in college. They found apprehension to "negatively affect" communication. (Anthony Petroskey, summary report on John A. Daly and Michael D. Millers' findings in "Research Roundup," English Journal, Dec. '76, p. 74)

The "Miscellaneous Category" containing the last four scales of the O.P.I. shows us probably the clearest picture of the relationship between personality factors and growth in writing. When examining the Altruism (AM) scale of the Miscellaneous Category, it is important to note that Heist and Younge found a significant negative correlation of -.48 (r of .20 required, to be significant at .01 level) between the economic scale on the Study of Values and AM. This indicates a moderately strong inverse relationship between the economic scale which had been found to be predictive of success in the college course and the O.P.I.'s Altruism scale. Also, the social scale in the Study of Values was shown by Heist and Younge to correlate at .46 with

Altruism. Keeping this in mind, there was a .20 correlation between Altruism and the whole sample, which indicates a definite but low relationship between high Altruism scale scores and growth in writing. Also, there was a .21 relationship between the improvers and Altruism, a slightly stronger figure that weakly supports the intuition that students with a concern for the welfare of their fellow men also tend to be more receptive to growth in writing ability. In line with this interpretation, there was a weaker .14 relationship between the writing regressors and the Altruism scale. Given the fact that the economic scale from the Study of Values is inversely related to altruism, and given the fact that a high economic scale score was shown to correlate negatively with success in the composition course in the Wisconsin study, it should be stressed that one could expect altruism to correlate positively with success on the writing diagnostic score. This did occur, supporting the intuition, although the positive relationship between Altruism and the writing gain scores was not as high as one might expect. Likewise, the Wisconsin study determined that the social scale in the Study of Values indicated that the students with a concern for people and issues outside themselves also tended to do well in the composition course. Given the above mentioned relationship between this social scale and Altruism, we could expect the same sort of relationship to occur with writing. Again, thid did happen although the correlation is not highly conclusive.

The Practical Outlook (PO) scale, a measure of utilitarian

or practical orientations, correlated strongly in Heist and Younges' findings with the above-mentioned economic scale from the Study of Values. The correlation between them was a .62 (r of .20 required, to be significant at the .01 level). Also, there was a negative correlation between Practical Outlook on the O.P.I. and the esthetic scale from the Study of Values. For my whole sample, there was .10 correlation between PO and growth in writing, and among the writing improvers there was a .08 correlation. Among the writing regressors there was a negative -.14 correlation between PO and the writing component. The Study of Values economic scale prepared us to expect that high economic scores or large concerns with practical matters of money tend to correlate inversely with success in the composition course. Thus, we might expect our similar Practical Outlook scale also to correlate inversely with success in the writing gain score. This was not confirmed as our writing improvers had a small positive correlation with Practical Outlook. I would conjecture, however, that writing in another mode, exposition for instance, would be inversely related with high practical orientation scores. I would also expect a positive correlation between such factors as theoretic orientation and thinking introversion, and growth on a expository writing scale. However, this remains to be researched.

As might be expected, there were insignificant correlations between the Masculinity-Femininity scale scores and the Response Bias scale scores, and growth in writing. The Masculinity-Fem-

ininity scale showed a negative .13 relationship with growth in writing for the whole sample. I was never interested in pursuing the relationship between this scale score and writing. Also, the Response Bias showed a negative -.02 relationship with growth in writing for the sample. Obviously, these scales from the O.P.I. are designed to be helpful when looking at other factors. The response bias in particular gives us a measure of the test taker's attitude and would not be expected to correlate strongly with growth in writing. I should note, however, that there was a .23 correlation between the Response Bias scale and the writing improvers. This indicates that those students who grew over the year on the writing diagnostic scale also had higher response biases when taking the O.P.I. In other words, one shouldn't take oneself too seriously. It appears the students who grew over the course of the year in writing ability also tended to dislike participating in standardized testing situations more than those who stayed the same or regressed.

This project has generated a wealth of data that has not yet been examined. I have not examined the individual scale scores for the entire high school and what they tell us by themselves about the Hoopa student profile. But there is also the question of other variables that could be correlated with the O.P.I. scale scores. Perhaps improvement is not necessarily the best variable to concentrate on when correlating writing ability and each of the O.P.I. scale scores. Perhaps it would be even more beneficial to look at where the students scored on the wholistic

scale during both portions of the writing sample and to search for the corresponding correlations with the scale scores. Perhaps a mean score indicating the student's place on the wholistic writing scale during both the "pre" and "post" test would be a more beneficial variable to test against personality factors. This then would tell us how high scoring writers, medium scoring writers, and low scoring writers correlate with the various personality orientations. Perhaps this would be a useful project and a natural next progression to be attempted using the wealth of untapped data I still have on hand. Any takers?

Chapter Three:

Conclusion and Implications--
Writing Liberates the Mind and Spirit?

Conclusion

My project set out to examine the influence of student attitude orientations on growth in writing ability. I used two separate evaluation components, the Omnibus Personality Inventory and a longitudinal writing sample, for several purposes. First, I assessed aspects of students' personalities using the O.P.I. Secondly, I used the two narrative writing exercises written by each student to measure individual growth in writing ability. The writing gain scores of the student sample were then correlated with the sample's individual O.P.I. scale scores on a Cyber computer.

On the whole at Hoopa High School, the students' narrative writing scores for the sample increased. One teacher's students in particular showed higher percentage of growth and grew at a greater rate than other teachers', although these teachers' students had a high percentage of growth too. This investigation dealt with narrative writing only: although the skills required to write well in the narrative mode would appear to be similar to those needed to write exposition, additional skills are required in order to master expository writing. In particular, exposition demands critical thinking skills, a notion of what constitutes a thesis with predication, a grasp of how to support that thesis, and control of temporal, logical and non-chronological ordering. In light of these differences, the results of correlating O.P.I. scales and writing could well have

been different with an expository or argumentative writing exercise.

A review of the significant correlations is enlightening. To begin with, the narrative writing regressors showed a .37 correlation with Thinking Introversion. I would predict just the opposite in the case of expository writing. The writing regressors had a negative -.28 relationship with Complexity: those who had little interest in complex ideas did not improve in writing ability. I would expect good expository writers to be interested in complexity. There was a .33 correlation between the regressors and the Autonomy scale: I would predict that high autonomy would be beneficial in exposition. The narrative regressors correlated at .34 with Religious Orientation, an inverse scale. This means that the narrative regressors tended to be religiously flexible: I would expect good expository writers to tend toward open-mindedness with respect to Religious Orientation. The narrative regressors correlated at .28 with Social Extroversion. Here, I would expect the same relationship to occur in an expository sample because clear well-thought-out expository prose demands private, individual thinking of quality, as well as reasoned opinions that may not be arrived at by their popularity.

The writing improvers had a negative -.29 relationship with high Impulse Expression, which indicates that impulsivity does not contribute to growth in writing ability. I doubt that excessive impulsivity would help at all in narrative or expository

writing: writing appears to be too deliberate an act for unedited impulsivity to be a benefit; this sort of "inspired" writing would lead to irrelevancies, non-sequitors, and problems in focus in formal essays, although it might be constructive in some forms (e.g. journal writing). Likewise, anxiety hinders growth in narrative writing ability and most likely all other modes as well. There was a .23 correlation between the writing improvers and Anxiety Level, another inverse scale: the students who improved the most tended to exhibit the fewest symptoms of anxiety. Authoritarian teachers take note: a little tension in the classroom between the instructor (the source of expectations) and the student (the aspirant) is healthy; too much general anxiety is counterproductive. Writing is one of the most feared tasks required in schools, and Daly and Miller have shown that the composition class needs to reduce writing apprehension to be successful. (Petroskey, p. 74)

Lastly, there was a .21 correlation between the writing improvers and the Altruism scale, a scale that is very similar to the social scale used in the Wisconsin study. Just as a concern for the well being of others demonstrated by the student's social scale score was shown to be predictive of success in the composition course, so have we demonstrated that altruistic students tend to be more likely to improve in narrative writing ability. I would also expect high Altruism scale scores to correlate with improvement and mastery of expository writing. More importantly, we are seeing life breaking in the door to

the classroom: altruism, long considered an important but non-pragmatic value, has a tangible effect on learning in the writing class!

Implications

All of this implies that student attitude orientations do play a demonstrable role in writing ability, and I would venture to say in all learning activity. The relationship between growth in writing and personality factors was not always what I expected, but the existence of that relationship is irrefutable. My assessment of student personality factors was limited by one thing: personality is not a constant and the O.P.I. is not a constant measure; as people change so do their attitudes and O.P.I. scores. Subsequent O.P.I. testing of these Hoopa High students would demonstrate this fact. In spite of this limitation, my research is a start on a task that is long overdue: figuring out the teacher's puzzle of why some students learn while others regress, and determining what we can do about it. I would like to generalize beyond my specific findings into the realm of what I think needs to be done to improve the infant science of teaching writing, and teaching in general.

We have concentrated far too long on objective skills alone in education, even in the language arts. Accountability, behavioral objectives, time limitations, overcrowding, and state and county mandated proficiency testing often leads us as educators

to take the easy way out: to concentrate entirely on curriculum and objective testing of skills, forgetting the questions of student motivation and attitude which after all are the final determinants of how much learning goes on in the classroom. Study of these factors is no longer so vague as to be vacuous. Clearly, we have much to learn about the roles that a student's ego, his personal attitude and his motivation play in learning, but we know enough now to stop pretending that we can change students' language performance by simply telling them about language. Eulert writes that it is a fallacy to teach as if we can change a student's learning behavior by telling him what we would like to see changed, which is essentially what strict adherence to objective skills does. He says:

> We would be expecting him to become a different person while ignoring (1) the system of values, (2) the frame of reference, and (3) the attitudes which lead to behavior. But changes in behavior must involve all the steps. If we expect a student to change his use of the language, we must start up the ladder from the bottom with him. (Eulert, p. 65)

We really do have a literacy problem in this country and in particular a writing competency problem that demands more effective teaching from the primary grades on. Many experts feel that at least 50% of college Freshmen in America need remedial work on writing. Roger Garrison captures this situation well when he writes:

> Twenty-five years of frustration with the usual methods of teaching freshman composition were quite enough. I was fed up, as most English teachers are, with endless stacks of mediocre papers piling up relentlessly every week, every month, all year; with minimum student

> improvement, despite my efforts; and with the increasingly defeated sense that a slob culture's effect on student language habits was much too strong for a mere school effort to combat. (Roger H. Garrison, One to One: Tutorial Instruction in Freshman Composition, an offprint, p. 55)

What needs to be done in the schools to effectively combat this state of affairs? We have listened to the clarion call of accountability and the resultant grammar based curriculum for too long. The evidence against the effectiveness of this approach has become overwhelming. The study of objective grammar skills per se is a legitimate task but one we can no longer allow to masquerade as teaching writing. I cite only one example in a multitude, from a position paper published by the Santa Clara County Committee on Writing:

> The New Zealand study set out to investigate once again the relationship between knowledge of grammar and good writing in secondary schools. All previous studies, Harris being the most widely quoted, had shown that the instruction of grammar had, at best, a negligible effect on improving student writing; but the researchers felt that these studies had weak links in their methodology. The New Zealand team set out to repeat previous experiments while closing all such possible loopholes...The results of the New Zealand study reinforced all previous findings and can be summarized as follows: The teaching of grammar, either traditional or transformational, does not affect a student's writing ability. The "no grammar" group improved as much as did the "transformational grammar" or the "traditional grammar" groups. If anyone justifies teaching grammar in our public schools, they have to find another justification other than it will improve student writing...The two grammar groups finished the three-year program with negative attitudes toward English. This was not true with the "no grammar" group. Said another way: you don't turn kids on by turning them off...(U)sing parts of speech as the objective criterion will encourage teachers to teach toward the test; districts will be encouraged to use parts of speech in establishing continuums, guarantee-

> ing that teachers will use valuable time teaching students how to recognize parts of speech. This is in the face of all research that shows grammar instruction does not significantly improve student writing; in fact, it may very well have a negative effect by displacing actual writing and fostering a negative attitude toward composition... (The Santa Clara County Committee on Writing, a "Position Paper," in Holistic Scoring--an Approach to the Assessment of Student Writing K-12, an offprint, pp. 1-2)

If this familiar technique of teaching prescriptive grammar is failing us, and I believe it is, then what must we do differently? We must begin by rethinking the role of student motivation in learning. James Moffett's student-centered curriculum is a step in the right direction. Teachers who use an arsenal of course-content weapons fired off in volleys according to their sighting of their students' abilities will balk at this new orientation, but it must be. We must set our sights on using the student's own interests and natural curiosity when trying to reach the goal of clear, vigorous expository prose in the high school and college writing courses. We must allow a reasonable amount of time to achieve this goal: a quarter is an absurdly short time to attempt this; a year seems to be a minimum. We must also incorporate the methods that our infant science has taught us are effective. There is far too much ritual behavior passing as teaching in the English class. Examine, if you will, an excerpt from a letter in Dr. Edmund Farrell's dissertation:

> My own research has convinced me that red-inking errors in student papers does no good and causes a great many students to hate and fear writing more than any-

> thing else they do in school. I gave a long series of tests covering 580 of the most common and persistent errors in usage, diction, and punctuation and 1,000 spelling errors to students in grades 9-12 in many schools, and the average rate of improvement in ability to detect these errors turned out to be 2 percent per year. The dropout rate is more than enough to account for this much improvement if the teachers had not even been there. When I consider how many hours of my life I have wasted in trying to root out these errors by a method that clearly did not work, I want to kick myself. Any rat that persisted in pressing the wrong lever 10,000 times would be regarded as stupid. I must have gone on pressing it at least 20,000 times without any visible effect. (Correspondence from Paul Diederich to Edmund Farrell in Edmund Farrell's dissertation Design Your Future, an NCTE Research Publication, p. 321)

Obviously, by increasing a student's actual experience with the craft of writing, by heightening his sense of purpose and audience, and by providing diagnostic grammar and syntax instruction when the student needs to incorporate these skills because of his desire for genuine communication, we can improve writing ability. The student's desire to communicate to a genuine audience is primary, and thought is in turn a necessary prerequisite to communicating. Good expository writing demands an understanding of basic syllogistic logic, running from a thesis/hypothesis through support/evidence to a valid conclusion. Also, a large portion of major flaws in student writing--lack of focus, cohesion and support--can be traced to thinking problems. A liberal arts education should train students to think and make reasoned judgements above all else.

Today, in 1980, we need more than ever before to rethink the role of our schools and to avoid what Mildred Henry and

Harriet Renaud call "situational and psychic foreclosure" or attitudinal conformity in students. Our world deals daily with military and economic strife and through the media children are painfully aware of it. They are, ready or not, thrown into a whirling dervish of a world that spins like a 33 rpm record running like a 78 rpm, tossing off crises like record lint. The music is playing too fast to follow; it is unharmonious; yet we know the tune. The Russians are in Afganistan to stay and threaten the late Tito's Yugoslavia; the Arab and Israeli conflict over the west bank is far from over and the death toll there is mounting; our American hostages in Iran are no nearer release than months ago and American blood has been spilled in the Iranian desert in an aborted rescue attempt. Inflation continues to cripple both the Soviet and American economies, and the world's horde of unemployed grows by the hour while Vietnamese, Cuban and Cambodian refugees pray for a place for their boats to land. What will we read about tomorrow at breakfast? At home in America the sound is the same: national uncertainty and flux is showing itself in the upcoming presidential campaign; Americans ask "who will lead?" and are unsure that there can be leaders anymore. Closer still, homocide and rape are on the rise in Humboldt County. In light of all these storm clouds, in the shadow of potential atomic destruction, what are children and young adults often learning in school?

They are learning, unfortunately, what they have traditionally learned: the rules, sometimes important ones, of the stu-

dent game. The student game can be many things in many different classrooms, and much learning takes place under its varied rules, but it is a game nonetheless; students are often isolated from the world around them by curriculums that ignore the reality of different student orientations, and, while the veneer between the real and the academic grows thinner and thinner, demanding that students be able to think and respond to reality as individuals, our schools continue to grind out homogeneous products. School boards, accountability task forces, and curriculum committees have tended to forget the student by concentrating on objective skills. Objective skills are important, but we can get at them only through the student as I hope to demonstrate. The philosopher David Hume wrote: "I hesitate to judge one man's act as good or another man's act as bad without knowing on what principles I proceed."

Is this concern being taught in schools, at any level? Do many people even think about criteria for knowledge and moral judgements? How many presidential candidates campaign with a platform of utilitariansim, economic democracy, legal equality, justice, fairness, moral weighing of human harms and human benefits, or anything at all ethically well reasoned? Now, in 1980, when the old adage "if you want something done right do it yourself" seems never more true, and when Kant's heart-felt imperative "act as if the maxim of your act were to become a universal law of nature" seems almost laughable in light of highjackings, hostages, and Cambodian genocide, we face a challenge that our

lives and well-beings may well depend on. We must delve out of the pseudo objective world of fact and into the inner subjective realm of values to examine the judgemental decisions we make, and we must do this right in the classroom. We must do this not just during current events hour, or in passing, or in fear of violating student's rights, for we have a moral obligation to teach judgement and critical thinking in school. Democratic principles cannot be learned in a vacuum: reason cannot be developed by osmosis.

In all education, our task is to enhance mental autonomy in students by posing problems and then getting out of the student's intellectual way, freeing him from "psychic foreclosure." We must teach judgement in all subjects, not indoctrinate, and we must teach only the natural ethical questions that arise out of a given discipline such as the concerns natural to such sciences as genetics and medicine, such humanities as philosophy and rhetoric, such social sciences as history and psychology, and such natural sciences as the environmental studies. In short, we must be teachers, not preachers, and we must not hide from the spectre of such fantastically difficult human questions as "when should a patient be allowed to die?" and "do affirmative action programs create new minorities?" Students' feelings about biological engineering, nuclear power, abortion, the E.R.A., sex education, and the arms race will be ultimately more important than whether they can recognize a whiz deleted relative clause. Students need a reason to use a relative clause before

it means anything to them. By giving them experience with multivariant points of view, we can help students build their critical thinking ability; we can help develop in them a sense of the kind of altruism that might have prevented the massive killing of Jews in Nazi Germany. I hope I have shown that related thinking and writing skills must come from the student's personal desire to communicate his own conception of truth about a subject, for this is the only way we can promote literacy in speech, reading and writing.

Our present system of teaching objective skills through testing often fosters mental dropouts, some of them quite capable of identifying a gerund. These students become mental dropouts because they are not equipped with intellectual and emotional flexibility: they are "psychically foreclosed." "Psychic foreclosure," an enemy of learning, occurs in the following kind of students according to Henry and Renaud:

> Not given to introspection, and out of touch with their own feelings, these kinds of foreclosed students accept "general opinion" as their value system, and handle difficult situations by conforming without conviction and adapting behaviorally without any internal restructuring of feelings and ideas...The perception of differences in values and style is a universal human problem: what often distinguishes between people most critically is the way in which the differences are handled. The psychically foreclosed individuals, whose instinctive response is to regard any difference as a threat of conflict, and any conflict as intolerable, move to avoid it. (Mildred Henry and Harriet Renaud, "Examined and Unexamined Lives," in The Research Reporter, CRDHE Publication, p. 6)

This sort of truth by concensus has, throughout history, repressed scientific inquiry, started inquisitions, burned

witches, regarded black people as subhuman and so on. These "foreclosed" minds obey the silent mandate "everyone believes that X is the case, therefore X is the case." Truth is often badly served in this type of argument, and so is learning. Henry and Renauds' findings and suggestions about what we must do to avoid fostering "foreclosure" agree with the picture I have been painting. They write:

> If we are to move closer to a realization of the liberal arts vision--toward increasing the individual's ability to examine the assumptions that guide his thought and action--we must devise an educational process that engages students more directly...Students should be given more direct help and practice in learning how to think more critically and constructively about their lives...Perhaps the most important change that needs to be made in undergraduate education is to provide an educational process for individuals who are developing, growing human beings. Accordingly, both the cognitive and affective or emotional dimensions of students must be given comparable attention. Students must be involved in critical, reflective thinking, experiencing, and acting. Without a wide range of opportunities for involvement and experimentation in these areas, they will be unable to put together a picture which includes themselves, others, and the larger world. (Henry and Renaud, pp. 7-8)

I would like to add that without this sort of teaching, students will obviously have a much more difficult time learning to write. Thus, a good teacher's task is to engage in Wilson Clough's "art and craft of persuading, coercing, cajoling, threatening, disciplining, entertaining, and outwitting others (usually younger) into the dawning of a suspicion that knowledge may be preferable to ignorance." (Eulert, p. 65) The writing instructor can help do this by becoming a problem-maker for students, by forcing them to face the complex issues

of the world without grasping at consensus opinion. The above-mentioned Complexity scale correlation defines this need. Likewise, the correlations found between success in the composition class and the Altruism scale of the O.P.I. and social scale of the Study of Values tell us something. They tell us that we need to change students' attitudes. Good teaching, in Eulert's words, means:

> ...making the student into a new person, one interested in questioning and in serving others more than in "getting mine." It means the teacher must foster attitudes of critical thinking rather than mere voting on ideas. When the student begins to weigh knowledge against self-deception, then we will have no difficulty teaching him how to express the new person he has become. His involvement with a world larger than his immediate physical, economic, and social concerns fixes his need for communication. (Eulert, p. 66)

To make students aware of the world beyond the immediate requires inviting the outer world into the classroom. We can help do this by getting students to undertake their own experiments in the life of ideas. I know of no better source of problems than reality: let us bring it into the classroom.

Appendices

Appendix A

Directions for Students Hoopa Writing Project

Please read the following to yourself while your teacher reads it aloud.

You are a writer for READ magazine which is read in 7th and 8th grade English classes all over the United States. Your assignment is to write a story about what happened one day when some machine went berserk. (Berserk means out-of-control). You consider several machines such as an elevator, TV set, lawn mower, telephone, car, garbage disposal, computer, etc. Then, you pick one machine and start writing. (You may write your own title if you choose).

Are there any questions about the topic?

Write your first draft on scratch paper. I will tell you to stop after 20 minutes. Then you will have 20 minutes to revise your paper on binder paper.

Are there any questions?
Begin.

Appendix A

Directions to Evaluators Hoopa Writing Project

Rating	Criteria
6	This paper... --Is an imaginative treatment of the topic developed by striking use of detail and example. --Is well-organized with an effective opening and conclusion; uses paragraphing appropriately. --Demonstrates a control of voice and audience that approaches a personal style. --Uses correct and varied sentence structure. --Uses correct spelling, punctuation, and syntax; errors are rare and/or clearly purposeful.
5	This paper... --Is a full treatment of the topic. --Has good examples and/or details that develop the topic. --Has good organization; it has an opening and a conclusion. --Uses paragraphing effectively. --Has a good sense of voice and audience. --Uses correct spelling, punctuation, and syntax with relatively few errors.
4	This paper... --Is a competent treatment of the topic. --Communicates reasonably well; uses some details.

Appendix A

Rating	Criteria
4 (con't)	--Has a sense of voice and audience.
	--Uses paragraphing that contributes to the effectiveness of the paper.
	--Has a conclusion.
	--Uses fair spelling, punctuation, and syntax although there are a few errors. There may be some fragments and/or run-ons.
3	This paper...
	--Shows an understanding of the topic.
	--Is fairly clear although it has some irrelevancies.
	--Has a sense of voice and audience.
	--Uses paragraphing.
	--Has frequent spelling, punctuation, and syntax errors although most are decipherable.
2	This paper...
	--Shows some understanding of the topic.
	--Communicates some meaning yet confuses the reader in parts.
	--Attempts paragraphing.
	--Has some sense of voice and audience.
	--Shows some knowledge of correct mechanics, but there are many errors.
1	This paper...
	--Is a misunderstanding of the topic.
	--Fails to communicate.

Appendix A

Rating	Criteria
1 (con't)	--Has no sense of voice and/or audience.
	--Lacks purpose and organization.
	--Uses extremely poor spelling, punctuation, and syntax.

Appendix A

Student Samples

930-274

Three years ago today marks the time in which the Ford Company, in Detroit, Michigan looked doomed forever. This story is about the struggles of top companys in a competitive business.

The Ford Company was at its highest production rate that any company had ever seen. They were turning out cars and trucks by the thousands and their sales were sky high.

What they didnt know was that the Dodge Company had hired a little proffessor named Berzonich. Berzonich was a german genius who would soon put a stop to Fords mass production rate.

You see Dodge Company was in a slump and way behind Ford. If Berzonich could pull it of they would give him one million dollars. If not he was doomed to die.

He came up with a plan and started to work. He got a job at the Ford factories working on the assembly line. He started disappearing from the line for short periods of time, several times a day. It always went unnoticed though.

And then on September 5, 1983 it happened! The machines were out of control. The workers just stared in bewilderment and the President of Ford had a mild stroke. The Ford Foundation was now producing tennis shoes at one hundred per minute.

Berzonich was apprehended outside of the factory. He was later sentenced to 5-10 years. His plans were great but he made one tiny mistake. He dropped his wallet in the control room. Ford survived and after three years they are now on top again.

Appendix A

142-387

This is a story of my stereo and the day it died. I was sitting on the floor, listening to some music, when the radio turns on all by itself. Whoa, wait-a-minute, I said to myself, what's happening here. I stood up, leaned over and looked down at the turntable. Sure enough, the record was still going, but the radio was too.

Then all of the sudden, the radio is playing a.m. and f.m. along with a little c.b. jargon.

The record started picking up speed, making Ray, Goodman and Brown sound like three chipmunks.

Just about the time my mom came in to find out what was going on the whole racket stopped. Then it started smoking, and sparking, and I started running for the door.

I get there and turn around, and the whole thing exploded like it was one huge firecracker.

When the repairman got there, he said it looked like an overload. When I told him what happened, he just shook his head and said "I hope it's still on warranty."

It wasn't.

890-905

The Robot

Essentially a good concept is he,

The android, the robot, whatever he be.

Appendix A

Bound by the three laws of robotics,
This creature of metal bionics,
He only learns and knows what you tell him,
And won't mind at all if you sell him
As he lives solely for your enjoyment,
Your leisure, good time, and your fun.
The only time owners get frantic,
Is when some over-zealous fanatic
Cries out "It's Monster!",
And tells him to "Begon Sir!"
And you have to start over again.

There's a controversy of sorts,
About when a robot shorts,
That he'll go mad and kill his own master.
But owners'll tell ya', it's he who moves faster,
That walks away safe and unscathed.

So begrudge not our robotic friends,
Since we use them to gain our own ends.
<u>Men</u> program them to kill,
They don't do it of their own will,
But get such bad press,
None-the-less.

Appendix A

932-283

MICRO-MARTIAN

Once in the small town of tutorville where the sun always shines, a man owned a appliance store. Mr. Perkins sold in his store toasters, coffee-pots, waffle makers, radios tv's Blenders, microwave ovens and conventional ovens.

One day Mrs. Atkins came in to by a oven. While Mr. Perkins tried desperatly to sell her a convetional oven all she could look was the microwaves. Finally he gave in and she bought one.

On the way home she noticed a tag that said "1/2 price slight irregularity". She thought this strange but conceeded to her greedy mind that said this was a great bargin.

Mrs. Atkins didn't know how to hook up the oven so she called an electrician. After the electrician had left she looked behind the oven where there was a loose wire hanging down, she read the tag on it which told how to connect it. Little did she know how she plugged it in could affect her life.

The directions were vague but finnally she made her decision and plugged it in. Un fortunatly for her she put it in wrong.

Atfirst the slight bulging at the sides was unnoticable but then all at once as if some great barrier had given way the sides buckeled expossing arms and legs. Now Mrs Atkins didn't know what to make of this but even before she could faint a green light came out of the thing which can no longer be called

Appendix A

an oven and turned her into a Micro-Martian. She was now one of the most dreaded things in the galaxie. The creature had turned her into a green thing about one foot high. The thing was now out the door turning everthing in its path green and small. Just as the world was on the edge of their seats wondering if they were doomed or not. Out of the air comes this Saucer shaped thing it lands by the creature and out of it steps a creature just like the first one only wearing black rimed glasses that radiated a strange green light. This new arival on the scence stopped and said "Son I told you not to wander more than 20 galaxies." The little one simply stated "Sorry dad". The older of the two then said "lets go get some more COSA ore and we'll come back and conqueur this nice planet.

for the continuing adventures of Micro-Martian Master read "The Master" by 932-283 or 832-283.

The End.

Appendix B

Description of the O.P.I. Scales

1. Thinking Introversion (TI)--43 items: Persons scoring high on this measure are characterized by a liking for reflective thought and academic activities. They express interests in a broad range of ideas found in a variety of areas, such as literature, art, and philosophy. Their thinking is less dominated by immediate conditions and situations, or by commonly accepted ideas, than that of thinking extroverts (low scorers). Most extroverts show a preference for overt action and tend to evaluate ideas on the basis of their practical, immediate application, or to entirely reject or avoid dealing with ideas and abstractions.

2. Theoretical Orientation (TO)--33 items: This scale measures an interest in, or orientation to, a more restricted range of ideas than is true of TI. High scorers indicate a preference for dealing with theoretical concerns and problems and for using the scientific method in thinking; many are also exhibiting an interest in science and in scientific activities. High scorers are generally logical, analytical, and critical in their approach to problems and situations.

3. Estheticism (ES)--24 items: High scorers endorse statements indicating diverse interests in artistic matters and activities and a high level of sensitivity and response to esthetic

Appendix B

stimulation. The content of the statements in this scale extends beyond painting, sculpture, and music, and includes interests in literature and dramatics.

4. Complexity (CO)--32 items: This measure reflects an experimental and flexible orientation rather than a fixed way of viewing and organizing phenomena. High scorers are tolerant of ambiguities and uncertainties; they are fond of novel situations and ideas. Most persons high on this dimension prefer to deal with complexity, as opposed to simplicity, and very high scorers are disposed to seek out and to enjoy diversity and ambiguity.

5. Autonomy (AU)--43 items: The characteristic measured by this scale is composed of liberal, non-authoritarian thinking and a need for independence. High scorers show a tendency to be independent of authority as traditionally imposed through social institutions. They oppose infringements on the rights of individuals and are tolerant of viewpoints other than their own; they tend to be realistic, intellectually and politically liberal, and much less judgmental than low scorers.

6. Religious Orientation (RO)--26 items: High scorers are skeptical of conventional religious beliefs and practices and tend to reject most of them, especially those that are ortho-

Appendix B

dox or fundamentalistic in nature. Persons scoring around the mean are manifesting a moderate view of religious beliefs and practices; low scorers are manifesting a strong commitment to Judaic-Christian beliefs and tend to be conservative in general and frequently rejecting of other viewpoints. (The direction of scoring on this scale, with religious orientation indicated by low scores, was based chiefly on the correlation between these items and the first four scales, which measure a general intellectual disposition.)

7. Social Extroversion (SE)--40 items: This measure reflects a preferred style of relating to people in a social context. High scorers display a strong interest in being with people, and they seek social activities and gain satisfaction from them. The social introvert (low scorer) tends to withdraw from social contacts and responsibilities.

8. Impulse Expression (IE)--59 items: This scale assesses a general readiness to express impulses and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or in overt action. High scorers have an active imagination, value sensual reactions and feelings; very high scorers have frequent feelings of rebellion and aggression.

Appendix B

9. Personal Integration (PI)--55 items: The high scorer admits to few attitudes and behaviors that characterize socially alienated or emotionally disturbed persons. Low scorers often intentionally avoid others and experience feelings of hostility and aggression along with feelings of isolation, loneliness, and rejection.

10. Anxiety Level (AL)--20 items: High scorers deny that they have feelings or symptoms of anxiety, and do not admit to being nervous or worried. Low scorers describe themselves as tense and high-strung. They may experience some difficulty in adjusting to their social environment, and they tend to have a poor opinion of themselves. (Note the direction of scoring on this scale: a high score indicates a low anxiety level, and vice versa.)

11. Altruism (AM)--36 items: The high scorer is an affiliative person and trusting and ethical in his relations with others. He has a strong concern for the feelings and welfare of people he meets. Low scorers tend not to consider the feelings and welfare of others and often view people from an impersonal, distant perspective.

12. Practical Outlook (PO)--30 items: The high scorer on

Appendix B

this measure is interested in practical, applied activities and tends to value material possessions and concrete accomplishments. The criterion most often used to evaluate ideas and things is one of immediate utility. Authoritarianism, conservatism, and non-intellectual interests are very frequent personality components of persons scoring above the average.

13. Masculinity-Femininity (MF)--56 items: This scale assesses some of the differences in attitudes and interests between college men and women. High scorers (masculine) deny interests in esthetic matters, and they admit to few adjustment problems, feelings of anxiety, or personal inadequacies. They also tend to be somewhat less socially inclined than low scorers and more interested in scientific matters. Low scorers (feminine), besides having stronger esthetic and social inclinations, also admit to greater sensitivity and emotionality.

14. Response Bias (RB)--28 items: This measure, composed chiefly of items seemingly unrelated to the concept, represents an approach to assessing the student's test-taking attitude. High scorers are responding in a manner similar to a group of students who were explicitly asked to make a good impression by their responses to these items. Low scorers, on the contrary, may be trying to make a bad impression or are indicating a low state of well-being or feelings of depression.

Appendix B

Descriptions Based on Most Frequent Responses

1. TI--High scorers: enjoy thought-provoking lectures, mull over ideas presented in class, examine and analyze their own motives and reactions, question teachers' statements and ideas, are interested in learning about history of human thought, and enjoy test questions in which information is in a different form than originally learned.

Low scorers: dislike reading serious or philosophical works, reading s rious poetry, writing reactions to a philosophical point of view, or spending leisure time writing essays; like short, factual questions in an examination better than those that require organization and interpretation.

2. TO--High scorers: endorse items reflecting an interest in reading about science, like speculating about problems which have challenged experts, enjoy conducting research and doing assignments requiring original research work, like looking for faulty reasoning in an argument, and prefer the man of ideas to the practical man.

Low scorers: do not like to read scientific or mathematical articles, or to write about the possible outcomes of a significant research discovery; prefer having a theory explained to them rather than attempting to understand it on their own; prefer several shorter problems to a long, rather involved one; and do not expect that mathematics will ultimately prove more

important than theology.

3. ES--High scorers: enjoy listening to poetry, looking at paintings, sculpture, and architecture, collecting prints of paintings, and reading about artistic and literary achievements; have tried writing poetry, and are fascinated by the effect of sunlight on objects and scenes.

Low scorers: have not dreamed about having time to paint or sculpture, do not like to read about artistic and literary achievements, or to make friends with sensitive and artistic men, would not like to be actors, and are not interested in the historical changes and developments of American jazz.

4. CO--High scorers: like to take a chance on something without knowing whether it will actually work, to play with new ideas even if they should turn out to be a waste of time, and to undertake projects about whose outcome they have no idea; the unfinished and imperfect holds greater appeal for them than the completed and polished, and they believe that for most questions there is more than one right answer.

Low scorers: do not like things to be certain and unpredictable, do not hate regulations, are not politically radical, and have not had peculiar or strange experiences; they prefer pleasant friends to those always involved in some difficult problem, and find straight-forward reasoning more appealing than

Appendix B

the search for analogies and metaphors.

5. AU--High scorers: feel that disobedience to government is sometimes justified, and do not favor strict enforcement of all laws no matter what the consequences; deny that only a fool would change the American way of life, that communism is the most hateful thing in the world today, that the most important qualities of a husband are determination and ambition, and that there must be something wrong with a person who lacks religious feeling.

Low scorers: feel that parents generally prove to know best, that young people get rebellious ideas but ought to outgrow them and settle down as they mature, that it is the responsibility of intelligent leaders to maintain the established order of things, and that only a callous person does not feel love and gratitude toward his parents.

6. RO--High scorers: deny that one must be wary of those who claim not to believe in God, that there is something wrong with a person who lacks religious feeling, that everyone should have complete faith in a supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question, or that their church or denomination has the only true approach to God.

Low scorers: believe God exists, that He hears prayers, and that what one believes does matter; they prefer being with

Appendix B

people who are religious, and in religious matters they never want to be called skeptics or agnostics.

7. SE--High scorers: usually enjoy parties, do not avoid large gatherings, do not prefer to stay at home rather than attend social functions, do not mind appearing on programs or giving oral reports, are cordial to strangers and talk with them when they travel.

Low scorers: do not enjoy teas and receptions, and their free time is not usually filled by social demands; do not enjoy being in a crowd just to be with people, do not like to take the lead at social gatherings, work better when alone, and prefer to work alone.

8. IE--High scorers: indicate that at times they feel like swearing and at times like smashing things, that they often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think, and that some of their friends think their ideas are impractical if not a bit wild; do not prefer people who are never profane, and do not subscribe to the statement that they have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it.

Low scorers: did not give teachers much trouble in school, were not sent to the principal for misbehaving, do not hate regulations, have never done any heavy drinking, and would be uncomfortable in anything other than fairly conventional dress.

Appendix B

9. PI--High scorers: do not often feel as though they had done something wrong or wicked, that no one seems to understand them, that there is a barrier between them and others, or that they are not as happy as others seem to be.

Low scorers: at times feel completely inadequate, have strange and peculiar thoughts, wonder who they really are and what they should really be like, and sometimes have impulses accompanied by such a strong feeling of urgency that they can think of little else.

10. AL--High scorers: deny that they feel they are about to go to pieces, that they are anxious or high-strung almost all the time, or that they find it hard to concentrate; claim they are happy most of the time.

Low scorers: frequently find themselves worrying, have periods of great restlessness, feel difficulties are piling up, are inclined to take things hard, and are more sensitive than most people.

11. AM--High scorers: are aroused by a speaker's description of unfortunate conditions in a locality or country, enjoy chatting and playing with children, enjoy showing foreigners around, and like to serve as members of a committee in carrying out some activity or project; take people seriously, believe a strong person can show emotions and feelings, and believe it is

Appendix B

wrong to try to circumvent the law.

Low scorers: would prefer to use leisure time to develop a favorite skill rather than do volunteer social or public service work; would rather not have responsibility for other people, tend to be somewhat spiteful, and feel that people pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

12. PO--High scorers: believe the best theory is the one that has the best practical applications; on tests, prefer short factual questions to those requiring the organization and interpretation of a large body of material; don't like uncertainty and unpredictability, find it annoying to listen to a lecturer who seems unable to take a firm stand, and believe it is the responsibility of intelligent leadership to maintain the established order.

Low scorers: find a greater appeal in ideas than in facts, prefer the man of ideas to the practical man, and like to discuss philosophical problems; do not feel that every person ought to be a booster for his own home town, or that there is only one right answer to most questions.

13. MF--High scorers (masculine): would rather teach chemistry and physics than poetry, like mathematics, do not get excited easily, are usually calm, and do not enjoy teas and receptions.

Appendix B

Low scorers (feminine): like dramatics, enjoy looking at paintings, sculpture, and architecture, and have found courses in literature and poetry as satisfying as most other subjects.

14. RB--High scorers: enjoy thinking about problems which challenge experts, find the idea of doing research appealing, and enjoy solving problems of the type found in geometry, philosophy, or logic; they feel close to people, and do not forget immediately what people say to them.

Low scorers: have sometimes felt difficulties mounting so high they could not overcome them, have had periods of great restlessness, often find themselves listening without hearing, and find it hard to concentrate on a problem for more than an hour or two at a time; they also feel that civil disobedience is sometimes justified.

The Psychological Corporation

New York, N. Y.

OPI ***

Form F

Paul Heist
George Yonge
T. R. McConnell
Harold Webster

PLEASE READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY.
DO NOT OPEN THE BOOKLET UNTIL YOU ARE TOLD TO DO SO.

This is not an ability or achievement test, but a means of reporting your attitudes, opinions, and feelings regarding a variety of subjects. Try to respond to all statements. However, if you would prefer not to respond to a specific statement, you need not do so.

In the booklet, you are to read each of the statements and decide whether it is *TRUE as applied to you*, or *FALSE as applied to you*. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE for you, blacken the answer space marked T. If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE for you, blacken the answer space marked F. Make your marks heavy and black.

Use a soft lead pencil to mark your responses on the answer sheet. *Do not make any marks on this booklet.* Erase completely any answer you wish to change. *Do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.*

Be sure that the number of each response you mark on the answer sheet agrees with the number of the corresponding statement in this booklet.

Copyright © 1959, 1963, 1968 by The Psychological Corporation.

All rights reserved. No part of this inventory may be reproduced in any form of printing or by any other means, electronic or mechanical, including, but not limited to, photocopying, audiovisual recording and transmission, and portrayal or duplication in any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

The inventory contained in this booklet has been designed for use with answer forms published or authorized by The Psychological Corporation. If other answer forms are used, The Psychological Corporation takes no responsibility for the meaningfulness of scores.

All rights reserved under the Berne Convention.

The Psychological Corporation, 304 East 45th Street, New York, N. Y. 10017

*** Removed due to copyright restrictions.

Appendix C

Report on Effectiveness of Redwood Writing Project Participants Teaching at Hoopa High School

The previously cited Redwood Writing Project follow up questionnaire for the years '77, '78 and '79 indicated that 90% of the participants were requiring more writing in their classes than before the various projects. If we believe, as many instructors do, that writing is a craft that develops with practice, then this increased use of writing in the classroom should be telling. All of the teacher/participants used more group work in their classes than previously: this too should be telling. Significantly, 96% of the participants enjoyed reading their students' work more than before. It should be no surprise, then, that 90% of the teachers enjoyed teaching writing more than the year before.

As a result of these new techniques, we might reasonably expect Redwood Writing Project teachers to prove superior in terms of improving their students' writing. Is this expectation borne out in reality? My limited sample indicates that it is. One Redwood Writing Project teacher/participant's classes showed a phenomenal 68% of growth over a year of instruction, though this was a particular case. This impressive statistic reflects the number of students who improved on the wholistic writing evaluation scale out of the number of students included in the sample. Typically, wholistic assessments of writing at high schools show quite small gain scores and significantly lower

percentages of growth than this one. While it can be misleading to generalize from the micro to the macro level, I feel that this particular Redwood Writing Project participant's success is indicative of the success of the entire project. In short, the higher expectations of these revitalized teachers seem to be becoming actualities.

Hoopa High School employs five English instructors who teach all of the students enrolled there. Of the English instructors, three had been Redwood Writing Project participants. Sadly, one participant died during the year and his class was lost for evaluation purposes. Another Redwood Writing Project participant's class did not take part in both portions of the sample. Thus, only the above mentioned participant's classes remained, along with the classes of two non-participants. (A fourth Redwood Writing Project member at Hoopa taught only business classes). After attrition, due to a student being absent on either the day of "pre" or "post" testing, and due also to students forgetting to code their papers with a number of their own choosing, the sample was reduced to 61 sets of complete scores. In spite of these limitations, the sample does indicate valid although small scale comparisons between classes taught by a Redwood Writing Project participant and those which were not. In fact, the number of students who improved on the wholistic scale in the remaining Redwood Writing Project participant's classes outnumbered all of those who improved in the rest of the school.

Appendix C

In the above mentioned classes, taught by the project participant designated as teacher "A" in the Table, 19 of 28 students or 68% improved over the school year, most of them by several points on the scale, while only two students or 7% regressed. This substantial growth far outstrips the 25% of the students who stayed the same in teacher "A's" classes. This can be contrasted by a 42% growth with 26% static and 32% regression in non-participant teacher "B's" classes. Likewise, non-participant "C" had over 50% of growth in his classes, but with a hefty 43% of regression.

I should point out that one could be afraid of selection bias in this sample since the teachers taught different grade level students: teacher "C" taught 9th graders, teacher "B" 10th graders, and teacher "A" 11th and 12th graders. One might assume that 11th and 12th graders would begin with higher "pre" scores, due to their added maturity, and would thus show smaller gains than the 9th and 10th graders who had more syntactic maturity to achieve. This did occur, but to an almost insignificant degree: the mean "pre" score in teachers "A's" classes was 6.9 compared to the other teachers' 5.8 mean "pre" scores. (These scores reflect the combined point total of two evaluators using the same six point scale: hence a range of two to twelve points was possible. The figures given are mathematical means.) What is more significant is that not only did a greater percentage of teachers "A's" students improve, but they also improved

at a greater rate. It is also important to remember that all of the students in the sample, regardless of age, had the same opportunity to display tangible growth in writing ability.

Clearly, teacher "A's" classes improved at a greater rate than those in the rest of the sample, moving up well over a point on the average from September to May. Teacher "B's" classes improved only .16 from mean "pre" score to mean "post" score. Teacher "C's" classes moved up .69 on the scale from "pre" to "post."

I think Hoopa High School has begun to reap the practical benefits of Redwood Writing Project instruction. Certainly, the project's past participants from all over the county feel that their training makes them more effective writing instructors. A glance at the enclosed survey proves that. Teacher "A" in particular had no hesitation about participating in this sample. He seemed to sense that his widened scope as a teacher would trickle down to his students. Before this sample was taken he said: "The Redwood Writing Project has made me a better teacher and I think the numbers should back that up...I'm excited to find out."

What is less tangible than these findings, and undoubtedly more important, is that the quasi-science of teaching writing has indeed begun to come of age. Programs like the Redwood Writing Project have given teachers the means necessary to take their students' early narrative strengths, those of a clear honest

Appendix C

writing voice and style directed to a genuine audience, and to develop them into the related skills needed to write well in all of the traditional modes. Redwood Writing Project teachers are able to take what they have learned directly into the daily regime of the classroom. They understand that if we are to teach writing we must reward and develop the student's distinct style, his confident sense of his own voice, and his attempt to inform a real audience, for these are the trappings of all good writing, in any mode, at any educational level. The program works. I am confident that future empirical research will confirm this fact.

Appendix C

Redwood Writing Project Evaluation of Teacher Attitudes Nine Months After Each Summer Institute

A project designed questionnaire was administered to every Teacher Consultant (TC) at the end of the academic year following the summer institute in which each was trained. The project had assessed the participant's response to each institute during the last week, but the Director felt that the evaluation of teachers fresh from the summer program might not tell much about practices for the forthcoming school year.

The questionnaire was sent in May, 1978, to every 1977 Summer Institute TC; in May, 1979, to every 1978 Summer Institute TC; and in May, 1980, to every 1979 Summer Institute TC. In May, 1981, the project will send the same questionnaire to TCs who were trained in both of the two summer institutes, the Humboldt State University campus program and the Southern Humboldt program held at Ferndale Elementary School.

Appendix C

Redwood Writing Project Questionnaire: Averaged Results for the Years '77, '78, and '79

1. How much writing are your students doing compared with last year?

   a. at least twice as much 52%

   b. more than last year 38%

   c. about the same as last year 5%

   d. less than last year 5%

2. How much group work, (peer editing, brainstorming, etc.) are you doing related to writing compared with last year?

   a. at least twice as much 48%

   b. more than last year 52%

   c. about the same as last year 0

   d. less than last year 0

3. How much publishing of student work are you doing compared with last year?

   a. at least twice as much 15%

   b. more than last year 40%

   c. about the same as last year 40%

   d. less than last year 5%

4. What types of publishing are you using?

   (Data not available)

Appendix C

5. How much letter grading of student papers (not report card) are you doing compared with last year?

a.	more	18%
b.	about the same	50%
c.	less	23%
d.	none	9%

6. How would you compare your students' writing with that of last year's students?

a.	much better	44%
b.	better	40%
c.	about the same	12%
d.	worse	4%

7. Are you writing the assignments you ask your students to write?

a.	always	4%
b.	most of the time	52%
c.	sometimes	26%
d.	never	17%

8. How do you enjoy teaching writing compared with last year?

a.	twice as much	43%
b.	more	47%
c.	about the same	9%
d.	less	0

Appendix C

9. How do you enjoy reading the writing your students do compared with last year?

a. twice as much	48%
b. more	48%
c. about the same	4%
d. less	0

10. How much do you enjoy writing yourself compared with last year?

a. more	74%
b. about the same	26%
c. less	0
d. not at all	0

A Teacher by Teacher Comparison of Percent and Rate of Growth

Sample	
Mean pre score:	6.20
Mean post score:	6.88
Mean improvement:	.68

(Con't)

Appendix C

Teacher "A"
RWP

Improved:	19 of 28 (68%)
Static:	7 of 28 (25%)
Regressed:	2 of 28 (7%)
Mean pre score:	6.96
Mean post score:	8.14
Mean improvement:	1.20

Teacher "B"
No RWP

Improved:	8 of 19 (42%)
Static:	5 of 19 (26%)
Regressed:	6 of 19 (32%)
Mean pre score:	5.89
Mean post score:	6.05
Mean improvement:	.16

Teacher "C"
No RWP

Improved:	8 of 14 (57%)
Static:	0 of 14 (0%)
Regressed:	6 of 14 (43%)
Mean pre score:	5.75
Mean post score:	6.44
Mean improvement:	.69

Tables

Table 1

Writing Diagnostic Results

Whole Sample (n=57)

	Mean	S.D.
Writing Gain Score:	.72	1.76

Improvers (n=30)

	Mean	S.D.
Writing Gain Score:	2.00	1.21

Regressors (n=10)

	Mean	S.D.
Writing Gain Score:	-1.90	.83

No Growth Category (n=17)

	Mean	S.D.
Writing Gain Score:	0	0

Table 2

O.P.I. Scale Correlation Results (calculated to hundredths)

	Test	Whole Sample Correlations	Improvers Correlations	Regressors Correlations
1.	Writing Gain Score	1.00	1.00	1.00
2.	TI	.18	.18	.37
3.	TO	.08	.04	-0.07
4.	ES	-0.01	-0.04	.15
5.	CO	.04	-0.17	-0.28
6.	AU	.16	-0.10	.32
7.	RO	.08	.01	.34
8.	SE	.16	.09	.28
9.	IE	-0.06	-0.30	-0.26
10.	PI	-0.10	.18	.09
11.	AL	-0.02	.23	-0.12
12.	AM	.20	.21	.15
13.	PO	.10	.08	-0.15
14.	MF	-0.18	.18	.30
15.	RB	-0.03	.23	-0.03

A Selected Bibliography

Cooper, Charles R. and Lee Odell. "Procedures for Evaluating Writing: Assumptions and Needed Research." College English. Vol. 42 No. 1. September 1980, pp. 35-43.

Diederich, Paul B. Measuring Growth in English. National Council of Teachers of English Publication, 1974.

Eulert, Don. "The Relationship of Personality Factors to Learning in College Composition." College Composition and Communication. May 1967, pp. 62-66.

Farrell, Edmund. Correspondence from Paul Diederich to Edmund Farrell in Edmund Farrell's dissertation Design Your Future. National Council of Teachers of English Publication.

Fleming, Margaret B., John Hollowell, and James R. Rankin. "What We Did Last Summer: Changing Attitudes of Writing Teachers." Conference on Language Attitudes and Composition (CLAC) Publication. Issue #7, May 1980, pp. 10-15.

Freeman, Jayne. "If You Teach Writing Write." Teacher. October 1979, pp. 74-77.

Garrison, Roger H. One to One: Tutorial Instruction in Freshman Composition, pp. 52-83.

Heist, Paul and George Younge. From the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. University of California Berkeley. Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual. The Psychological Corporation, 1968.

Henry, Mildred and Harriet Renaud. "Examined and Unexamined Lives." The Research Reporter. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. University of California Berkeley Publication, pp. 5-8.

Keech, Kathy. A telephone interview. 4 November 1980.

McReynolds, Paul et al. "Review of the Omnibus Personality Inventory." In "Personality Tests and Reviews II." Seventh Mental Yearbook Reviews: Personality-Nonprojective. Vol. 7 No. 116, pp. 494-99.

Petroskey, Anthony. "Apprehension, Attitudes, and Writing." A report on John A. Daly and Michael D. Millers' research in "Research Roundup." English Journal. December 1976, p. 74.

The Santa Clara County Committee on Writing. "A Position Paper." Holistic Scoring--An Approach to the Assessment of Student Writing K-12. March 1978, pp. 1-2.

Trent, James W. and Leland L. Medsker. Beyond High School--A Study of 10,000 High School Graduates. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. University of California Berkeley, 1967.